

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, DC

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON
FEBRUARY 10, 1989, IN LISNER HALL
ROOM 603

The meeting was called to order by President Trachtenberg at 2:15 p.m.

Present: President Trachtenberg, Vice President French, Registrar Gaglione, Birnbaum, Chaves, Cohn, Deering, Divita, East, Elgart, Fox, Garris, Griffith, Grub, Kenny, Kirsch, Leonard, Liebowitz, Morgan, Parrish, Prats, Robinson, Schiff, Tolchin, Wade, and Yezer

Absent: Parliamentarian Schechter, Berkovich, Burdetsky, Burks, Cibinic, Friedenthal, Moore, Painter, Paratore, Park, Smith, and Solomon

The President introduced Professor Alan G. Wade, a new member of the Senate, who was replacing Professor Robbins.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of January 13, 1989, were approved as distributed.

Professor Robinson asked if there was any objection to changing the order of business so that Item 5. "Remarks by President Trachtenberg" could be taken up at this point, inasmuch as the President had to leave the meeting early. No objection was made, and the Senate proceeded to Item 5.

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT TRACHTENBERG

The President presented his remarks to the Senate. In conclusion, he said that he would be happy to respond to any questions. (Remarks by President Trachtenberg are attached hereto and made a part of these minutes.)

Professor Morgan said that he agreed that some of the questions raised by the President were critically important, but he wondered how the administration was going to proceed in the immediate future to attempt to resolve some of those questions of prioritizing. The President responded that it might be useful to take a look at the host of planning initiatives that were taken over the past several years to determine to what extent there were commonalities that could be drawn upon. However, he said, what was clear was that choices would have to be made which was not always easy in a collegial environment.

He said he would be glad to have the advice of the Senate on what it thought an appropriate process might be.

Professor Kirsch, speaking as both a member of the Senate and the Budget Advisory Team, asked how the Senate might be informed about the issues and range of possibilities being discussed by the Budget Advisory Team so that the Senate could offer its advice also. The President replied that he would probably do what he has done in the past and that would be to circulate the report of the Budget Advisory Team to a fairly-wide constituency in order that they could have some appreciation for the kinds of decisions that were being made.

Professor Yezer asked if the accounting definition of the current fund deficit was, in fact, the proper measure of the University's true economic condition; if the President was suggesting that there was some desired ratio of the undergraduate student to the graduate and professional level; and if the President was satisfied with the micro-incentives facing the faculty here and whether they were consistent with what might be expected for the University's plan in the future. Answering the questions in reverse order, President Trachtenberg said that he thought micro-incentives ultimately were issues that needed to come from the faculty through department chairmen through deans to Vice President French and to himself. He noted that some faculty had already been in contact with him about various things that could be characterized as micro-incentives, which the administration would be happy to consider doing within the resources and capacity of the University to respond to them. He said that it seemed to him that some things appeared to be sufficiently sound enough as to be left alone, while other things appeared to have been so significantly neglected as to require some redress. With regard to the question about a ratio of undergraduate students to others, the President said that he did not have an iron-clad notion in that respect, but pointed out that the kind of generic reputation that an institution has usually comes from the world's perception of its undergraduate student body because they were the ones who published the newspapers, wore the sweatshirts, etc. The President said that, with respect to the current fund deficit, the numbers stated were close enough and that the deficit needed to be dispatched in a prudent way because there were a variety of new things that had to be done.

Professor Griffith asked the President if he would comment on what issues he was prepared to move on in the short term; what issues he thought were the important long-term ones facing the University; whether he planned to ask the Faculty Senate or other faculty groups for advice; and what he planned in the way of organizational changes, if any. President Trachtenberg responded that one area receiving immediate attention was admissions, where major initiatives were being taken to attract students from a larger pool and to increase minority enrollment. He said that he did not contemplate any major reorganization although he did expect to personalize his own participation in the administration of the University in a slightly different way. In the event there would be any major changes, he said the Senate would be informed. Professor Griffith thanked the President for

responding to his request at the previous meeting for an update. The President then left the meeting after turning the Chair over to Vice President French.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION 88/5, "A RESOLUTION CONCERNING INCREASING CONTRIBUTIONS FOR FULL-TIME GRADUATE STUDENT SUPPORT"

On behalf of the Committee on Research, Professor Garris, Chairman, moved the adoption of Resolution 88/5, "A Resolution Concerning Increasing Contributions for Full-Time Graduate Student Support," and the motion was seconded. Professor Garris said that the major thrust of this resolution was that high-quality research in the University was based on full-time graduate students, principally doctoral students, and on excellent quality graduate students, and this resolution would enable the University to recruit such students. He pointed out that the key words, "fully support" in the second RESOLVING clause meant "tuition plus stipend," so that the matching funds provided by the University would not be "true dollars," but "tuition dollars." Professor Garris said that although the administration has taken parallel initiatives in graduate student support, the funds requested in this resolution were not necessarily new funds because this resolution called for a matching of a fully-supported student with one that was fully-supported from the outside.

Professor Morgan inquired about the source of internal funding for the stipend. Professor Garris explained that that would be an expenditure to the University, but the Research Committee was of the opinion that it would be cost-effective because it could stimulate sponsored research and could attract the best graduate students, who, otherwise, would not come to this University unless it could offer them an excellent package.

Professor Cohn commented that it seemed to him that the Senate went through this same exercise at the last Senate meeting on a proposal to provide funds for the Library and, while he thought that that proposal and the one before the Senate today were both desirable programs, he did not think the Senate intended to ask the University to expend funds at this point in time. He then moved to amend the resolution by striking the second RESOLVING clause in its entirety. The motion was seconded.

Professor Griffith said he recalled that part of the goal of the current fundraising campaign was to raise money which would be used to endow research. He asked if the Senate could have some clarification as to whether there was a specific plan for handling gifts to the endowment for research and whether those were being targeted specifically to underwrite faculty research. Vice President French replied that it was his impression that there wasn't much unrestricted money coming in for research, but that Vice President Worth could provide that information.

Professor Yezer spoke in favor of the amendment because he said that endowment funds in University accounting were kept separate from the current fund simply from the point of view of fiscal responsibility, and that any notion that current expenditure was tied to an endowment gift would be irresponsible. Professor Tolchin suggested that perhaps an implicit part of this resolution would be to ask what percentage of the endowment funds could be spent at this point in time, i.e., what percentage has been restricted and what percentage has not been restricted, and possibly to request that some of that money be earmarked for this purpose. Professor Fox said that he did not believe that this resolution was intended to promote endowments, and Professor Garris agreed, stating that the Research Committee very expressly did not want to limit this resolution to endowments. Professor Divita said that it seemed to him that the resolution was being interpreted to mean different things to different people; he, therefore, suggested that the resolution be sent back to the Research Committee for clarification. Further discussion followed by Professors Grub, Garris, Divita, and Griffith. The question was called, and the Cohn amendment to strike the second RESOLVING clause was carried.

Professor Schiff expressed his concern about the following matters. First, he said, industries that give grants do so in a lump sum without separating tuition and stipend, and he wanted to be assured that this practice would not preclude the awarding of a matching grant by the University that included tuition. Second, there could be a problem where a grant might be for one year only and the University would suddenly be faced in the second year with having two students who may not have second year support. Third, the University may be very successful in getting outside grant money but there may be a limit on the number of graduate students a department or unit can handle even if it had the support.

At this point, Vice President French indicated that he would have to leave the meeting because of a prior commitment off campus. Before leaving, however, he said that, in the event this resolution was returned to the Research Committee, he would be pleased to meet with the Committee to discuss the very lengthy inventory of undertakings that the administration has in the area of graduate student support, some of which were known and some of which were not yet fully published. He then turned the Chair over to Professor Robinson and left the meeting.

Professor Morgan said that he agreed with Professor Divita that the language of the resolution needed additional clarification because of the endowment/non-endowment implications, and he moved that Resolution 88/5 be recommitted to the Research Committee with instructions that it be bought back at the next Senate meeting on March 10, 1989. The motion was seconded. A discussion followed by Professors Tolchin, Yezer, Divita, and Garris. The question was called, and the motion to recommit with instructions was carried. (Resolution 88/5, as amended, is attached.)

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Robinson, on behalf of the Executive Committee, reported on the activities of the Committee. (The report is attached hereto and made a part of these minutes.)

BRIEF STATEMENTS

Professor Morgan commented that, in reading the minutes of the last meeting, he was reminded of the resolution passed by the Senate at that time urging the faculty to support the University libraries by making a special contribution this year, either as an additional pledge or a new pledge, to be designated for acquisitions. He, therefore, wondered if the members of the Senate needed any further communication about this resolution from the Development Office to remind them of their responsibility to respond to their own urging. Professor Deering asked whether the President had formally responded to this resolution, and Professor Robinson replied that the resolution did not require the President's response.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion made and seconded, Professor Robinson adjourned the meeting at 3:50 p.m.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "J. Matthew Gaglione".

J. Matthew Gaglione
Secretary



THE
GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

Washington, D.C. 20052 / Office of the President / (202) 994-6500

"DETERMINED PEOPLE"

By

Stephen Joel Trachtenberg

When our colleague Professor Griffith graciously invited me to address the last meeting of the Faculty Senate on the subject of the University's condition and future possibilities, I demurred on the grounds that this was not a topic to deal with "off the top of my head." Having had a few days to think about the subject, it may be that the right moment has arrived for what I will call a first assessment of the state of the institution. This afternoon I will try to say a few words about several scenarios that have been offered for the next stage of its development.

Stephen Joel Trachtenberg joined The George Washington University as President and Professor of Public Administration in August, 1988. Prior to that he served, for eleven years, as President of the University of Hartford and Professor of Public Administration and Law. Remarks at Faculty Senate Meeting, February 10, 1989.

Needless to say, I will try to repeat as few as possible of the remarks that I made to the most recent Faculty Assembly. I'm confident that just about every member of the Senate was there, and that those who were unable to attend have reviewed the minutes of that gathering or may if they wish.

I imagine that most of you are familiar with the academic joke about the departing university president who offers some sage advice to the incoming president about how to handle crises that look as if they are spinning out of control. He does it by handing him three envelopes, sequentially numbered, with instructions to open them as the crises occur.

A few months go by, and crisis erupts. When it has passed from being merely intolerable to becoming actively dangerous, the new president opens the first envelope and finds the following instructions--quote: "Blame the past administration."

That works well enough, and several years go by while the remaining two envelopes slumber on a corner of the president's desk. Then another crisis erupts--one of such magnitude that it makes him feel almost nostalgic for the previous round of trouble. He rips open Envelope Number Two and finds that the advice consists of a single word: "Reorganize."

Heads having rolled hither and yon, new faces having been installed in key positions, the president settles back for a few more years of peace only to be rudely awakened, in due course, by the worst crisis of all. Faculty members are picketing, students are transferring out, angry alumni are on the phone, and the education editor of the local paper is permanently encamped on the university's doorstep. Hands trembling, the president opens the third and final piece of advice, which is: "Prepare three envelopes!"

Well, I myself have had a lifelong aversion to blaming previous administrations. I dislike having to suggest--through reorganization--that others are at fault where current problems are concerned. I'm also not very inclined to give unsolicited advice to my successors. And I'm very happy indeed to be serving as the president of a university where the very idea of such behavior is entirely inappropriate.

Having spent a number of years in Washington during the Johnson administration, I well remember The George Washington University back then and can compare it, in an informed manner, with The George Washington University that exists right now.

The differences are astonishing. The growth and development of the institution have been--and I choose my adjective

carefully--breathtaking. The accomplishments of Lloyd Elliott, of the GW faculty and of the GW staff have few parallels in the history of American higher education. At the same time, of course, I do not mean to imply that in the twenty years since I left Washington for New England, the University has solved all of its problems. There are still, I'm happy to report, a few matters that call for attention on my part and on yours. There are still a few obstacles to surmount before we build on our present very positive and nationwide status to the point at which folks at Yale, Chicago or Harvard break into a cold sweat when they hear our name mentioned.

The very first point I would like to make today, therefore, as I assess the condition of our school, is that the self-image apparently shared by some of those at GW--including a number of faculty, staff and students--lags far behind the University's remarkable accomplishments of the past two decades. Indeed, when our student newspaper recently described GW as--quote--"horribly average," and alleged that this judgment could be supported from--quote--"every college guide in the country," I was taken sufficiently aback to write a brief reply.

What amazed me was that, as far as I could tell, I was the only person on campus to do so. But perhaps "amazed" is a bit too

strong. I had already become aware of a certain culture of self-denigration that seemed to me widespread on this campus. What surprised me was to have that culture, which is usually shared on a private basis--often in the form of parenthetical suggestion rather than outright argument--so clearly and concisely articulated.

That posture of self-doubt, which at its extreme end slides into actual self-flagellation, looks to me like the greatest obstacle this university faces as it renews the commitment to growth and change that was so typical of the Elliott Years. It represents a set of assumptions that won't go away just because time is passing.

Rather, this attitude needs to be confronted by all of those who feel attracted toward it, because what it amounts to is a self-fulfilling prophecy of a particularly destructive kind. In the student editorial to which I've already made reference, it leads to a tone--whining, plaintive and above all passive--that expects higher quality to result from efforts made by others...by the University administration or trustees or faculty...rather than by the students themselves. There is no suggestion in the editorial, for example, that students ought to volunteer for admissions-related work, or that they

need to generate higher levels of personal ambition. It might even be fair to say that the editorial represents a typically modern faith in mechanism rather than individual, caring, determined people.

I've said all that in order to make it clear that our quest for a more energized and intellectually-inclined student body is a collective endeavor rather than one that can simply be delegated to "the administration" or "the Admissions Office." At the same time, I'd like to emphasize that there is no aspect of our admissions procedures and publications that is not presently under intense scrutiny, and that is not a candidate for major revisions. Together with the financial health of the University, about which I will have a bit more to say in a moment, admissions and the quality of our students are my top-drawer concern, just as it ranks very high in your own order of priorities.

And now I'd like to digress for just a moment in order to give you a sense, or a renewed sense, of how deeply the "internal culture" of American universities tends to differ from the external perceptions entertained by the American public and its legislative representatives. As I make my way around Washington on a typical day, I, of course, get buttonholed by

all kinds of people, ranging from those I meet at the White House or on the Hill to those who cut my hair and sell me my shirts, on the subject of The George Washington University and its missions, programs and functions.

Needless to say, I'm all set to discuss curricular issues in terms of the traditional Western orientation of "the humanities" versus the newer view that the Western tradition is only one part of what needs to be taught. I'm prepared to offer an opinion or two on the dialectics of teaching and research, the use of prepared or underprepared teaching assistants, the adequacy or inadequacy of how we teach writing and other forms of communication, the degree to which universities have been divided up into competing fiefdoms, and whether or not it is true that most university presidents, after five years on the job, are basket cases in need of serious psychiatric intervention.

Thus tuned up, I find that the questions I get asked on a typical day are almost without exception devoted to the subject of our basketball team, which, as you know, has not been compiling a record guaranteed to be of interest to those who plan the Olympics. Lest you think that I may be the sort of a guy who just naturally encourages people to talk about sports

rather than ideas, let me quote a few words from a recent article in Change magazine by William A. Sederburg, a Michigan state senator who himself comes from an academic background and who chairs the Senate's Higher Education Appropriations Subcommittee. "Legislative interest in higher education varies in direct relation to the success of major sports teams, especially football teams," Sederburg observes, and he goes on to say--quote:

Coming from campus, I assumed that the legislature (and governor, for that matter) might be interested in the educational process. I thought it might matter how many Rhodes Scholars graduated from our institutions or how our GRE scores were doing. Not so.

I found that legislators accurately represent public interest in higher education as well as the public's interest in political matters. The key to getting legislators to talk about your institution is not to have a winning chess or debate team but to have a high-profile sports

team. The public talks about winning teams, and so does the legislature.

There is a lesson to be derived, I think, from both Sederburg's experiences in Michigan and my own in Washington, one we need to keep in mind here at GW as we seek to steer our ship toward its even better future. The lesson is that we must be very careful not to confuse our awareness of the University with that of people in what we significantly term "the outside world." We must do that, moreover, at a time when those folks in the outside world are playing and will be playing an ever more significant role in determining our destiny.

Like it or not, we in higher education have become major news. Discussions of our innermost policies and behaviors can now be found on the editorial pages of major newspapers and newsmagazines, including The Washington Post and The New York Times. Those discussions are finding their way onto network TV*

*I myself will appear on "Adam Smith's Money World," Channel 26 (PBS in Washington), WETA TV, on Saturday, February 11, 1989, at noon.

and onto movie screens as well, not always in a very charitable spirit. If those who would like to prosecute us for alleged malfeasance are combined with those who see us mainly as sources of sports entertainment, then we at GW and we in the academic world as a whole are politically--which is to say, economically--very vulnerable.

For those gathered here today, and for all of those affiliated with The George Washington University, that means avoiding as much as possible the mistaken idea that the next five or ten years will represent--quote--"business as usual." We had better concentrate on making ourselves quite unusual, and a paradigm for other universities to follow, if we intend to weather some of the storms shaping up on the academic horizon.

What I am touching on now is the intrinsic vulnerability that should encourage us to build up our strengths and to begin thinking of ourselves as a school with a certain uniqueness and a certain sense of mission. And that, in turn, brings me to the last subject I want to touch on today, which is George Washington's specific financial vulnerability.

It's less than a pleasure, I assure you, to assume a university presidency and to find that the school has a \$12 million

current fund deficit. As sophisticated observers are well aware, a figure like that, once it's officially on the books, always implies that a program deficit has already sprouted, burgeoned, and spread its branches far and wide...that cutbacks in crucial parts of the budget have preceded the final admission of defeat, and that the activities known as scrimping and saving, having failed to avert a disaster of this magnitude, have also left behind a mood of bitterness and exhaustion.

Anyone who doubts what sophisticated observers have always believed need only look at The George Washington University in order to have the wisdom of those observers confirmed. The school's library budget is down to the point which challenges the overall quality of our collections, and their viability as academic resources. Faculty members vociferously proclaim that their salaries are below the prevailing market rate for a university of this kind. Graduate students complain with equal passion that they are not getting sufficient support. Faculty and staff seize all kinds of occasions in order to inform me that our fringe benefits are insufficiently generous or their offices are in need of repair.

Researchers in a variety of disciplines let me know that their work is being made difficult or impossible by inadequate

funding. I hear over and over again that our data processing facilities are not as up-to-date or as available as they should be...that more space is needed for dance and music...that we need better soccer fields...and that we need a lot more and a lot better et ceteras.

I agree completely. I'm sure you agree completely. And the question now is: what kinds of decisions need to get made, by all of us working together, if we are to accomplish our two major goals:

Goal Number One: to bring our current fund deficit down, and finally to eliminate it altogether, a task that will take a number of years to accomplish.

Goal Number Two--to create a university with a clearer sense of identity, mission, character and esprit de corps than is presently the case...one that will, therefore, attract more favorable attention from all of those who can help us climb higher, including alumni, legislators, corporate donors, foundations, government agencies, individual donors, and all of those who qualify as--quote--"influentials."

Here are some of the questions we will have to answer as we proceed toward these goals:

- * Has The George Washington University overarticulated itself? Are we moving in so many directions simultaneously that we are now a loose federation of special interests rather than an organic whole?
- * Is the University showing a trend toward what is known as magical thinking: the idea that once you have verbalized a need of some kind, it can be left to the--quote--"powers that be" to see to it that the need is met?
- * Can we pursue the notion of turning this into a major research university if we have not first created the major undergraduate college that is found at the heart of every research university worthy of the name, with the exception of Rockefeller University?
- * Can we pursue the notion of moving George Washington toward an enhanced mission of research without some conscious prioritization--a careful, clear, justifiable choice of the specific fields in which research will be encouraged, and an equally careful, clear, justifiable set of decisions with regard to the fields that will receive support with a different and ultimately less expensive focus?

Those are a few of the questions that leap up at me as I try to think my own way toward our future. I know there are other questions--in your minds as well as my own--that will also need to be answered as we move from the University we have toward the University we would love to have.

Let me end on a positive note. The reputation we presently have in this country, and the one we will inevitably have to make one of the pillars of our future condition, is that of a school of higher education in which every specific field is unusually tied to the world of practice--in both national and international terms. Our location in the very heart of Washington, and the good use the University has made of it, accounts for this reputation, which in turn will help to bring us the quality and quantity of students we need to sustain our payroll and our spirits. We are seen, in other words, as excelling in issues of policy, the application of knowledge toward the hopefully positive, practical goals that will influence how our planet operates and how it is going to survive.

Let us confirm that strength of ours by applying it to our own future as an institution of higher learning. When we have shown that we can even heal ourselves, we will not be too

surprised to have others--others whom we respect--asking us to help them with their major problems. They, in turn, will be grateful rather than astonished by what we are able to provide. And we will have good reason to look back with amusement on the day when there were still those on our campus who thought of The George Washington University as a place that was "horribly average" rather than splendidly unique.

I thank you!

rlc

A RESOLUTION CONCERNING INCREASING CONTRIBUTIONS
FOR FULL-TIME GRADUATE STUDENT SUPPORT (88/5)

- WHEREAS, a major goal of the University has been to improve and increase research productivity; and
- WHEREAS, research productivity is intimately connected with the availability of high quality full-time graduate students; and
- WHEREAS, the availability of such full-time graduate students depends upon the availability of competitive financial support packages; and
- WHEREAS, the recent study by the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs has shown that full-time graduate student support at George Washington University is below that of its national competition as well as its neighbors; and
- WHEREAS, endowed funds and contributions for graduate student support have been shown to be particularly low; NOW, THEREFORE,
BE IT

RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

That the University shall take such actions as are necessary to solicit and promote contributions specifically for full-time graduate student support; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

~~That for each contribution to fully support one or more full-time graduate students, the University will match that contribution for an equal number of full-time graduate students under equal conditions.~~

Research Committee
January 14, 1989

Recommitted, as amended, February 10, 1989, with instructions for reintroduction at the March 10, 1989, Faculty Senate meeting.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 10, 1989
BY PROFESSOR LILIE F. ROBINSON, CHAIRMAN

On behalf of the Executive Committee, I would like to report on its activities subsequent to our January meeting.

The Committee discussed further the Report of the Special Committee on the Consolidation of the School of Public and International Affairs in order to direct specific issues raised in the report to Senate Standing Committees for their consideration and recommendations, as appropriate.

Subsequent to one of its periodic reviews of the status of resolutions passed by the Senate, the Executive Committee has requested Administration action on those resolutions from the 1986-1987 and 1987-1988 terms on which no action was taken by the previous administration.

I would also like to direct your attention to the fact that in response to the Senate's request contained in the Resolution on University Libraries, the Development Office is taking steps to ensure communication of the contents of that Resolution to faculty through publication of the appropriate information in the GW Report. Vice President Worth's staff is also considering other means of communicating the contents of the Resolution.

I would also like to report that the grievance in the Medical School and the nonconcurrence in the Arts and Sciences continue in process.

To date, the Executive Committee has received two resolutions for the March meeting. Should there be other resolutions for that meeting, please note that they must be received prior to the next meeting of the Committee on February 24.

Thank you.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

The Faculty Senate

January 30, 1989

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, February 10, 1989, at 2:10 p.m., in Lisner Hall 603.

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of January 13, 1989
3. Resolutions:

A RESOLUTION CONCERNING INCREASING CONTRIBUTIONS FOR FULL-TIME GRADUATE STUDENT SUPPORT (88/5); Professor Charles A. Garriss, Chairman, Committee on Research (Resolution 88/5 is attached)
4. Introduction of Resolutions
5. Remarks by President Trachtenberg
6. General Business:

Report of the Executive Committee: Professor Lilien F. Robinson, Chairman
7. Brief Statements
8. Adjournment



J. Matthew Gaglione
Secretary

A RESOLUTION CONCERNING INCREASING CONTRIBUTIONS
FOR FULL-TIME GRADUATE SUPPORT (88/5)

- WHEREAS, a major goal of the University has been to improve and increase research productivity; and
- WHEREAS, research productivity is intimately connected with the availability of high quality full-time graduate students; and
- WHEREAS, the availability of such full-time graduate students depends upon the availability of competitive financial support packages; and
- WHEREAS, the recent study by the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs has shown that full-time graduate student support at George Washington University is below that of its national competition as well as its neighbors; and
- WHEREAS, endowed funds and contributions for graduate student support have been shown to be particularly low; NOW, THEREFORE,
BE IT

RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

That the University shall take such actions as are necessary to solicit and promote contributions specifically for full-time graduate student support; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

That for each contribution to fully support one or more full-time graduate students, the University will match that contribution for an equal number of full-time graduate students under equal conditions.

Research Committee
January 14, 1989